

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 10/028,052	Applicant(s) FLOYD ET AL.	
	Examiner Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1732	

**All Participants:**

(1) Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.

(2) Douglas B. Little.

**Date of Interview:** 2 September 2004

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
n/a

Claims discussed:  
34-35

Prior art documents discussed:  
that cited.

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
*A proposed examiner's amendment to make claim 34 comensurate in scope to claim 1 by incserting a limitaiton that places the laminate chamber in a die portion. Other corrections regards typographical errors were also discussed.*


  

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)